

Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx
 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Docket Number (Optional)

190250-1690

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

on _____

Signature _____

Typed or printed name _____

Application Number

10/735,405

Filed

December 12, 2003

First Named Inventor

Parker

Art Unit

3627

Examiner

Danneman, Paul

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

☐ applicant/inventor.

/BAB/

☐ assignee of record of the entire interest.
 See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.
 (Form PTO/SB/96)

☒ attorney or agent of record. _____
 Registration number 58,169

☐ attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. _____
 Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____

Signature

Benjamin A. Balser

Typed or printed name

(770) 933-9500

Telephone number

July 21, 2008

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required.
 Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.

☐ *Total of _____ forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Privacy Act Statement

The Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579) requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (i.e., GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of:

Parker

Serial No.: 10/735,405

Filed: December 12, 2003

Confirmation No.: 2122

Group Art Unit: 3627

Examiner: Danneman, Paul

Docket No.: 190250-1690

For: Payroll Based on Communication Switch Statistics

REMARKS IN SUPPORT OF
PRE-APPEAL BRIEF CONFERENCE

Mail Stop Appeal Brief
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicant submits the following remarks in support of a Request for a Pre-Appeal Brief Conference.

REMARKS

Applicant submits that the following clear legal deficiency exists in the rejection. Namely, the previous Office Action improperly uses the hindsight gleaned from the instant application to argue that the elements of the independent claims are obvious in view of the teachings of *McDuff*. Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art, using the disclosure of *McDuff*, would not have integrated the set of switching statistics with the set of work statistics to determine operator efficiency without using hindsight gleaned from Applicant's disclosure. Therefore, the rejection is improper, the rejection should be withdrawn, and the claims allowed.

I. Status

Claims 1, 3-15, 17, and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *McDuff, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,350). Claims 2, 16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *McDuff, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,350) in view of *Stuart, et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0032120).

II. Rejections of Independent Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §

Independent claim 1 recites:

1. A payroll system comprising:
logic configured to obtain a set of switching statistics from a database of a communications switch;
logic configured to obtain a set of work statistics of an operator;
logic configured to determine an operator efficiency parameter by integrating the set of switching statistics with the set of work statistics;

logic configured to determine when the operator efficiency parameter exceeds an expected efficiency parameter.
(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that the rejection in view of *McDuff* is improper. Even if, assuming for the sake of argument, *McDuff* discloses the gathering of general statistics, *McDuff* fails to disclose the specific function of integrating the set of switching statistics with the set of work statistics. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that, regardless of which statistics are used, the function of integrating any statistics is not obvious in light of *McDuff*. Applicant respectfully submits that without using hindsight gleaned from Applicant's disclosure, gathering useful data fails to suggest determining operator efficiency from the data. The data is simply collected and reported. Agent efficiency levels are never even alluded to in *McDuff*.

The Office Action admits that the reference does not disclose integrating the set of switching statistics with the set of work statistics to determine an operator efficiency parameter. However, the Office Action alleges that the element is obvious because the reference discloses (1) gathering statistics regarding agent calling activity, (2) statistics gathered include average handling time, average work time, average talk time, etc., and (3) the statistics are used to generate reports useful to a supervisor or other manager. Applicant respectfully asserts that a report that presents the raw data in a pie chart or a graphical representation is useful to a supervisor and manager. *McDuff* doesn't suggest any more than presenting the statistics in a report. *McDuff* doesn't mention operator

efficiency at all. *McDuff* surely doesn't suggest integrating one particular statistic with a second particular statistic to determine operator efficiency.

Additionally, since, as shown above, *McDuff* fails to suggest the determination of operator efficiency, *McDuff* certainly fails to *determine when the operator efficiency parameter exceeds an expected efficiency parameter*.

As the cited reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest, either implicitly or explicitly, all the elements of claim 1, the rejection should be withdrawn for at least these reasons. Independent claims 8 and 17 are allowable for similar reasons.

For at least the reason that the independent claims are allowable over the cited references of record, the dependent claims are a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims contain all the features of the independent claims. Therefore, the rejection of the dependent claims should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, favorable reconsideration and allowance, or the re-opening of prosecution on the merits of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Respectfully submitted,

**THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER
& RISLEY, L.L.P.**

/BAB/

Benjamin A. Balser, Reg. No. 58,169

600 Galleria Parkway, NW
Suite 1500
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-5948
Tel: (770) 933-9500
Fax: (770) 951-0933